

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

ADB951143

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

FROM:

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors;
Administrative/Operational Use; APR 1952. Other requests shall be referred to Office of the Adjutant General (Army), Washington, DC 20310.

AUTHORITY

AGO per DTIC form 55

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

AD B951143

52-26

RESEARCH NOTES

Number 52-26

Apr 11 1952

UNANNOUNCED

DDC
RECEIVED
NOW 14 1979
E

14 AGO-PRS-RESEARCH NOTE-52-26

6 CONSTRUCTION OF CRITERION INSTRUMENTS FOR THE VALIDATION
OF THE COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CORPS TEST BATTERY

PJ-3501-05

DDC FILE COPY

10 J. A. Parrish

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

003650
PERSONNEL RESEARCH SECTION
PR AND P BR, AGO

79 11 07 147

E. A. Rundquist
Research Note 52-26

CONSTRUCTION OF CRITERION INSTRUMENTS FOR THE VALIDATION OF THE COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CORPS TEST BATTERY

In 1947, the Director of Personnel and Administration, in response to a request by the Director of Intelligence, directed TAG, PR and P Branch, to conduct necessary studies leading to the development of a test battery for the selection of Counter Intelligence Corps agents. The report which follows will describe the rationale and development of an instrument for the collection of criterion data.

In CIC investigative work it is difficult to secure on-the-job evaluations of agent performance. Theoretically, it would be desirable to evaluate an agent while observing him during actual investigative interviews. However, the presence of a third person would likely vitiate the success of the interview.

The problem of determining an adequate criterion against which to validate the experimental test battery was discussed with representatives from the CIC Center, Fort Holabird, Maryland. As a result of these discussions, it was decided that the composite criterion should include supervisor's and associate's evaluations of the agents' on-the-job performance, and some type of evaluation of investigative reports submitted by the agents. Report evaluation was considered desirable because it involved the judging of a product, rather than a recording of the subjective estimate of observed behavior. In CIC work, it appeared, there was little opportunity for close observation of behavior; consequently, ratings of job proficiency would be much more subject to bias.

A large number of CIC agent reports were obtained with a view to the development of job analysis data regarding the duties performed by agents. It was planned to construct a set of rating scales (from this "job analysis" data) which would allow evaluation of the most pertinent factors involved in agent performance.

A set of twenty rating scales was constructed according to the above-mentioned plan. However, before the scales were submitted to the printers for reproduction, research data from other programs became available. These cast doubt on the wisdom of the proposed plan of attack. In these other programs, a similar method of approach had been used for criterion scale construction, i.e., involving the use of job analysis data. It was found that ratings on these job analysis scales intercorrelated so highly that essentially the same results could have been obtained with the use of a single rating scale of over-all job proficiency. Therefore, it was decided to use a single rating scale for the CIC study, and to obtain multiple ratings wherever possible. Such an approach would represent a major savings in time required for administration of the scales, and would consequently result in less of the agents' time being taken from their investigative duties.

An expert CIC report reviewer was obtained to evaluate uncorrected copies of reports submitted from the field. The proposed procedure would require each headquarters or detachment to submit five uncorrected agent's reports prepared by each agent, to the CIC Center. The expert reviewer would then evaluate the reports on a specially-constructed rating form.

Decision as to the final procedure was to be withheld until a sufficient sampling and reviewing of reports could be accomplished. After a considerable number of reports had been received, it became apparent that the reports were not in uncorrected form--that the field installations were submitting the best possible reports in final form, thus vitiating the report evaluation.

An alternative procedure was established which would provide for the immediate supervisor or reviewer in the field to evaluate uncorrected reports, thus removing the stigma of having "work samples" submitted to the highest authority, i.e., the CIC Center. This latter procedure would also tend to insure the obtaining of essentially uncorrected reports at the initial stage of review.

In developing the form to be used for report evaluation, it was believed that a common metric should be employed.

The advantages of a common metric for criterion purposes lies in the fact that various criteria are expressed in directly comparable units. Also, the weighting of criterion elements can be obtained directly, in accordance with their intrinsic importance to the efficiency of the job or organization. Further, use of time as a common metric insures equal units between points on the continuum.

A report evaluation form was developed which utilized three scales which embodied the desirable feature of a common metric as well as directly observable bases of judgment. The unit of measurement employed was expressed in terms of "time required to correct" the various types of errors found in the reports.

The first scale required the reviewer to record the amount of time required for correcting errors on each of the five reports which did not require contacting the agent. That is, these errors necessitated only editorial correction and did not reflect upon the quality of the agent's investigation.

The second scale required the reviewer to record the amount of time taken for correcting errors which necessitated contacting the agent. These errors were of such a nature that clarification or further information was needed from the agent to complete the report; however, they did not require additional field work on the part of the agent.

The third scale was concerned with errors in the report which would require the agent to undertake additional field investigation, i.e., whether one additional contact was required, two or more additional contacts required, or whether the errors were such that complete reinvestigation was required. Also, the reviewer was to indicate the amount of time usually required for each of these degrees of reinvestigation.

In addition to the scales for report evaluation, blanks were provided on the criterion form for recording such information as the number of months the reviewer had known the agent, the number of his uncorrected reports the reviewer had seen, the number of cases completed by the agent during the last six months, number of his cases which required reinvestigation, and number of his reports returned for rewriting.

The final form of the criterion instrument, together with the directions for its use, is contained in Appendix I.

PERSONNEL:

Program Coordinator (Acting): Mr. L. R. Harmon
Project Director (Acting): Mr. J. A. Parrish
Statistical Advisor: Dr. M. R. Marks
Preparation of Report: Mr. J. A. Parrish

DATE: 8 August 1951

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
2	

Appendix I
CIC CRITERION FORM AND S.O.P.
FOR REPORT EVALUATION

Area _____
Region _____
Detachment _____
Rater _____

Blacken in one of the 20 boxes opposite each man's code number how well you would like to have him as a CIC Investigative Agent

[illegible]

RATING SCALE

Each of the dotted lines under RATEE MAN NUMBER the code number
 agent you are to rate.

n one of the 20 boxes opposite each man's code number to show you would like to have him as a CIC Investigative Agent.

Satisfied to have him						Prefer him to most.				Fight to get him					DO NOT MARK HERE						
1	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
2	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
3	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
4	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
6	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
7	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
8	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
9	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
10	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
11	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
12	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
13	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
15	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
16	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
17	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
18	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
19	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
20	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
21	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
22	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
23	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
24	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
25	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
26	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
27	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
28	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
29	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20						
30	6	7	8	9	10	11	12														

CIC CRITERION FORM PART I
REPORT EVALUATION

Area _____
Region _____
Detachment _____
Rater _____

Pull copies of the last five representative reports with
Approximately how many months have you known this agent? _____
Approximately how many uncorrected reports of his have you known? _____
How many cases has this agent completed the last six months? _____
How many of his cases required reinvestigation? _____
How many of his cases were returned for rewriting? _____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

A. Errors that can be corrected without contacting the agent.
REPORT NUMBER Minutes required to make it acceptable

1	5	15	25	35	45	55	60+	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							

B. Errors that require contacting the agent.
REPORT NUMBER Minutes required with agent

1	10	30	50	70	90	110	120+	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							
5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16							

C. Errors that require reinvestigation.
REPORT NUMBER

1	a	b	c	d	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16				
3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16				
4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16				
5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16				

D. How many hours would it take to correct: c b _____ ; c c _____ ;

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

CIC CRITERION FORM PART 1

REPORT EVALUATION

Ratee Man Number _____

the last five representative reports written by this agent.

how many months have you known this agent? _____

how many uncorrected reports of his have you reviewed? _____

has this agent completed the last six months? _____

a cases required reinvestigation? _____

a cases were returned for rewriting? _____

DO NOT MARK HERE

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

acting the agent.

it acceptable.

60+

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

[7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]

(Read through entire Directions before completing this form)

REPORT EVALUATION
CIC CRITERION FORM PART I

I. General

Part I of the CIC Criterion Form is to be completed only by those persons who in the course of their work review a representative sample of the agents' uncorrected case reports. These reviewers may be detachment commanders, operations officers, assistant operations officers or officers in any other similar category. Evaluation by more than one report reviewer will be secured if possible. The individual most directly concerned with review of the given agents reports should, however, always be included. These report evaluations must be independently completed by each reviewer.

Each reviewer will select the last 5 representative reports submitted by the agent. Use uncorrected reports. The reports will then be evaluated on Part I of the CIC Criterion Form.

II. Directions for Completion

A. Identifying Information

In the upper left corner enter:

1. The Code Number of this Major Command.
2. The Code Number for the region or similar next largest command channel under this Major Command.
3. The Code Number for the detachment or similarly designated unit to which you are assigned or attached.
4. Your Code Number.
5. The ratee man number or Code Number of the agent whose report you are now evaluating. Only one agent can be rated on each report evaluation form.
6. BE SURE THE CODE NUMBERS YOU ENTER ARE CORRECT.

7. Complete the blanks in the top center of the page.
8. The question, "How many of his cases required reinvestigating?" Is to be interpreted as "... required some degree of reinvestigation through some fault, oversight, etc., of the agent."

B. Report Evaluation

1. Errors that can be corrected without contacting the agent

These errors may be described in general as those requiring only editorial correction by the reviewer. They include lack of clarity, poor style, poor grammar, poor phraseology, bad spelling, and other errors of a similar nature that are not serious enough to require contacting the agent, but can be corrected by the reviewer. That is, these errors do not reflect on the quality of the agents investigation.

The amount of time required by the reviewer to correct these errors for each of the 5 selected reports is to be recorded to the right of each report number. The mid-points of estimated time range to cover each report is above each column of boxes. Notice that there is a 5 above the column of boxes numbered 1, 15 above the column of boxes numbered 2, etc. If between 0-10 minutes of the reviewer's time is required to correct errors of this type on report 1, blacken in the first box in the line of boxes opposite Report Number 1. If 10-20 minutes were required, blacken in the box under 15 opposite Report Number 1.

2. Errors that require contacting the agent

These errors require clarification or more information from the agent about the case; that is, they are of such a nature that the reviewer cannot correct the report without contacting the agent. They do not include errors requiring additional field work or reinvestigation of any sort.

The time scale calls for an estimate of the amount of time of the reviewer actually spent in obtaining additional information from the agent and clearing up ambiguities of the nature that would otherwise reflect on the quality of the investigation.

The mid-points of the time range required to correct errors of this type on each report are listed above the column of boxes. If 0-20 minutes were required with the agent on Report Number 1, blacken in the box under 10 in the row of boxes by Report Number 1, etc.

3. Errors that require reinvestigation

These errors are of such a nature that the agent and reviewer cannot make an adequate case report without some actual field recheck.

The following scale points are used:

The box under a would be blackened if no reinvestigation was required.

The box under b would be blackened if a minor check was required.

The box under c would be blackened if two or three additional checks were required.

The box under d would be blackened if reinvestigation was required.

Example a: No errors requiring additional field contact occurred.

Example b: (Minor check) The agent had failed to obtain a needed birthdate, or an address, or birth place. To obtain this information another contact was necessary.

Example c: (Two or three additional checks) The agent had failed to obtain two or three pieces of information such as listed above under Example b.

Example d: (Reinvestigation) The agent just didn't do the job he was assigned and either he or another agent must go back and do it right.

The next question does not refer to this particular agent. We want an average figure which shows for all agents and for each degree of reinvestigation, your estimate of the time it takes to correct each of these three types of errors.

4. How many man hours would it take to correct errors Cb, Cc, Cd

Write on the Report Evaluation Form in the appropriate blank the number of hours it takes, in general, to make a minor check, Cb; two or three additional checks, Cc; and reinvestigation, Cd. Because of difference of nature of assignment, the difference in time required to correct these three degrees of reinvestigation vary from case to case without the difference in time being an accurate judgment of the agents' proficiency. Therefore, this time estimate should be based on the time required in general (for any assignment) to correct these errors.